

THE SYSTEM OF VERBAL WORD-FORMING CATEGORIES IN THE MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Semyonova Marina Albertovna

Senior Lecturer, Department of Russian Language and Literature, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

The article deals with word-building categories of verbs as a generating and regulating mechanism in relation to the ways of verbal action. The role of aspect and voice categories in the formation of verbal SCs in Russian is revealed.

Key words: *derivatology, word-formation category, word-formation meaning, aspect and voice categories, modes of verbal action.*

Word-building categories (SC) in various aspects are studied in the works of domestic and foreign linguists: A. A. Shakhmatov, M. Dokulil, R. S. Manucharyan, J. Onkhiser, Z. A. Volotskaya, E. A. Zemskaya, E. S. Kubryakova, D. A. Osilbekova, G. V. Belyakova, M. I. Zadorozhny and others, however, the system of the Russian NC is practically not described both in relation to nominal parts of speech (PR) and in relation to the verb. In relation to verbal SCs, the role of the categories of aspect and voice in their formation has not been fully revealed. The role of word-formation categories as a generative algorithm and systemic factor of verbal vocabulary and, at the same time, a link between morphology and vocabulary, has not been practically studied. No connections were found between the categories of aspect and voice, word-formation categories and modes of verbal action (SVD). In our opinion, the study of all types of interaction between the categories of aspect and voice, SC, word-formation types (ST) and SHD in the generative and functional aspects can shed light not only on the specifics of verbal vocabulary and word formation, but also on the essence of the categories of aspect and voice in the Russian language.

Grammatical categories of aspect and voice Russian language, despite the long tradition of studying (see the works of L. P. Razmunsen, A. A. Potebnya, A. A. Shakhmatov, V. V. Vinogradov, A. M. Peshkovsky, Yu. S. Maslov, A. V. Bondarko, N. S. Avilova, P. A. Soboleva, A. N. Tikhonov, A. M. Lomov, M. A. Shelyakin, A. A. Kholodovich, M. A. Shemyakin, A. V. Isachenko, I. G. Miloslavsky, R. Ruzhichka and many others) can be attributed to those objects of linguistics, in relation to which the solution of some problems, general and particular, gives rise to new, no less complex ones. Despite the brilliant description of many aspects of the categories under consideration in Russian and Slavic studies, the correlations of aspect and voice with the word-formation system have not been revealed systematically and explicitly enough. To a certain extent, this can be explained by the disunity of the concepts of aspect and voice and the theory of word formation, as well as the predominance of the analytical approach in this theory. "All relatively complete descriptions of the word-formation system were created within the framework of the analytical system-structural direction (this also applies to descriptions of Polish and Czech word-formation). From other positions, the word-formation system of the Russian language (as well as any other language) has not yet been fully described; for example, there are no descriptions of a word-formation system based on a generative model or functional grammar" [7. S. 3].

Both the generative and functional aspects of word formation are associated with the theory of word formation categories, which is in its infancy. All of the above, in our opinion, indicates the relevance of this study. The word-formation category is understood by us, following R. S. Manucharyan, as a unity of word-formation meanings and a system of means of their expression [4. pp. 201–202], therefore, in principle, SC is

not limited to the limits of one way of word formation or even one part of speech (for example, SC “subjective assessment” in Russian combines derivatives of three parts of speech in lexical realizations: nouns, adjectives and adverbs).

According to A. V. Bondarko, “derivation by its very nature is open to the far-reaching influence of vocabulary, which creates difficulties and obstacles for the correlativity of word forms and leads to inconsistent implementation of this correlativity” [1. S. 101]. However, this question can be put in a different way: to what extent do lexical meanings (LS) experience an organizing influence from morphology (through the semantics of parts of speech (PR) and grammatical categories) and word formation (through the SC system). The legitimacy and effectiveness of this approach is convincingly proved in the monograph by E. S. Kubryakova “Language and Knowledge”, in which the author promotes the idea of a cluster organization of lexical meanings: “Just as grammatical categories develop the general idea of ”, i.e. they detail and break up this idea, word-formation (onomasiological) categories continue the begun division or create a new one. But they cannot go “contrary” to the general idea embedded in this or that CR” [3. S. 198].

Both as a result of discussions about the status of members of the aspect pair and the number of voices in the Russian language, and as a result of the intensive development of the theory of word formation in recent decades, it can be argued that the categories of aspect and voice in the Russian language, in opposition to the categories of mood, tense, person, - these are classifying categories of a word-forming nature, replenishing and organizing the verbal vocabulary. During their implementation, not morphological, but word-forming derivation is observed. Ways of expressing specific and voice meanings in Russian are actually word-building: prefixal, suffixal, postfixal (postfixal), and within the ways of verbal action they can be combined (prefixal-suffixal, suffixal-postfixal, prefixal-postfixal). The members of a species pair are considered by us as different words, as a kind of word-formation pairs connecting the generating and the derivative. Compared to other intraverbal word-formation pairs, aspectual correlates are closest in lexical semantics to their generating ones, but are not identical to them. This applies to both prefixal aspectual pairs (in case of perfectivation) and suffixal pairs (in case of imperfection). It is noteworthy that A. N. Tikhonov, one of the most convinced supporters of the grammatical nature of the opposition of members of aspect pairs and the presence of purely aspect prefixes in the Russian language, in lexicographic practice actually takes the opposite point of view: each aspect correlate in the "Derivational Dictionary of the Russian Language" is considered as a separate lexeme with its own word-formation paradigm [6]. This, in our opinion, reflects an objective picture of speciation in the Russian language. A similar point of view on the category of aspect is presented in the Grammar of the Modern Russian Literary Language [2. S. 339].

However, the word-formation mechanism for expressing aspectual oppositions in no way undermines the grammatical status of this category, since aspect is an obligatory feature of every verb and every verbal word form. The most important for the formation of word-building meanings (SZ) of the verbal word-building system of the Russian language are the values of time, space, quantity (in various refractions: multiplicity and intensity), effectiveness, subject and object. The semantics of the subject and object is relevant not only for nominal, but also for verbal word formation, it is especially significant in those parts of the word-formation system that are associated with the implementation of voice meanings.

Derivational meanings (SZ) within each part of speech reflect primarily categorical semantics (for the verb – procedurality) and are grouped into word-formation categories (SC). However, SCs are units of double reflection: they reflect “something” in extralinguistic reality and, at the same time, the specifics of the

grammatical structure of the language. The functional definition of SC corresponds to the definition of a grammatical category (GC): if GC is the unity of grammatical meaning and formal means of its expression (primarily inflectional), then SC – the unity of the SZ and formant means of its expression [4. S. 202]. Each SC is a set of differential features, the defining of which is the word-formation meaning, has its own set of formants and morphonological transformations as means of embodying the lexical implementations of certain SCs.

As is known, there are two points of view on the scope of SRS: 1) SRS cover both non-derivative and derived verbal vocabulary (Yu. S. Maslov, A. V. Bondarko, M. A. Shemyakin); 2) SRS are limited only to morphemically characterized verbal vocabulary (N. S. Avilova). The second point of view seems more convincing to us, since even non-derivative verbs in Russian can be morphemically characterized, for example: roll - roll, swim - swim, crawl - crawl. At the same time, SRS are lexical associations, a kind of lexical-semantic groupings of verbs. SHD is often called semantic-derivative groupings of verbs. "In this perspective, SGD are modifiers of the semantics of the original verbs in the direction of temporal, quantitative, resultative modification... The classification of verbs according to SGD crosses the division of verbs into transitive/intransitive, reflexive/irreflexive, as well as the division of verb vocabulary into lexico-semantic groups (LSG), representing a secondary formalized system... Quantitative SRS are reduced to 5 word-formation categories: SC multiplicity, temporal limitation, intensity, effectiveness, comitativity" [8. pp. 8–9]. From our point of view, the above statement correctly reflects the role of the SRS, however, this approach does not take into account the abstract nature of the word-formation meaning and the more abstract essence of the word-formation tier compared to the lexical one. The modes of verbal action do not coincide with the SC of verbs and are not reduced to word-building categories. From our point of view, SCs are formal semantic patterns of verb formation, and specific verbal lexemes, lexical implementations of certain SCs, are grouped into SRS, lexico-semantic groupings.

Thus, the SC and SRS are ob- units of varying degrees of abstraction and belong to different linguistic tiers, respectively word-formation and lexical. At the same time, it should be emphasized that the active study of SHD partially compensated for the lack of attention to SC in derivatology compared to the comprehensive study of word-formation types (ST). As is known, mutual relations of verbal categories are carried out in the following aspects: 1) in the interaction of meanings (for example, aspectual and temporal); 2) in paradigmatics; 3) in the functioning of verb word forms in speech and text. In addition, the interaction of the semantics of aspect, tense and voice is manifested in the organization of intra-verbal word-building categories. The aspect category most closely interacts with the category of time both in paradigmatic and semantic-functional aspects. However, the paradigmatic organization of the category of time is not related to the processes of word formation in the Russian language; if the category of time is related to these processes, then only by its semantic basis, inseparable connection with the specific semantics. Only the categories of aspect and voice are generative in relation to intraverbal word formation, both in semantic and formal aspects.

We join the point of view P. A. Soboleva, who considers species correlation more than the formation of species pairs: "And unpaired verbs can have species correlation if they are associated with verbs of the opposite species by derivational relations" [5. S. 220]. In intraverbal word formation, all possible types of speciation are observed: nesov. view > owl. view; owls. view. > nonsov. view; nesov. view > nesov. view, owl view > owl. view. For example, the type of speciation of nons. view > nesov. the species is realized by lexemes related to intermittently softening SRS (pain, smoke, pee, whistle, walk around, glance), long-term softening SRS (whistling, humming, dripping), long-distributive SRS (pacing, thinking, singing, driving around), complicated-

intense SHD (dance, tap, dance, lash). Type of speciation of owls. view > owl. look - lexemes related to the mitigating SRS (amuse, squeeze, hold, cuddle, push, count, forget). However, the most productive type of speciation in Russian is the type of nesess. view > owl. type, in the implementation of which not only prefixes, but also suffixes take part (when expressing a one-time occurrence). It should be noted that there are much more ways of verbal action than SC, which is the systematizing role of word formation in relation to vocabulary. Within the SC, derivative verbs are lexical implementations of certain STs, however, many SHDs are not limited to the framework of one ST (see above complicated-intensive and mitigating SHD).

Thus, the word-building categories of verbs, which are formed in the Russian language primarily by the categories of aspect and voice, represent a generative and regulatory mechanism in relation to the modes of verbal action. The derivational axis of the systemic nature of verbal vocabulary is connected with the grammatical categories of aspect, voice, SC and SHD of the verb, and the interaction of these categories and verb groupings needs further study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Бондарко, А. В. Теория морфологических категорий. Л. : Наука, 1976. 255 с.
- [2] Грамматика современного русского литературного языка. М. : Наука, 1970. 767 с.
- [3] Кубрякова, Е. С. Язык и знание. М. : Языки славян. культуры, 2004. 556 с.
- [4] Манучарян, Р. С. Словообразовательные значения и формы в русском и армянском языках. Ереван : Луйс, 1981. 312 с.
- [5] Соболева, П. А. Словообразовательная синонимия и полисемия. М. : Наука, 1980. 294 с.
- [6] Тихонов, А. Н. Словообразовательный словарь русского языка : в 2 т. М. : Рус. яз., 1985.
- [7] Улуханов, И. С. Единицы словообразовательной системы русского языка и их лексическая реализация. М., 1996. 222 с.
- [8] Халикова, М. И. Типы семантического взаимодействия глаголов количественных способов действия с элементами контекста в современном русском языке : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Ташкент, 1997. 20 с.